Case 5:11-cv-01071-MAM Document 1 Filed 02/11/11 Page 1 of 10

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	NOTICE TO NOT THE REVERSE OF THE FORMS,	DEFENDANTS
William A. Daile	э у	Lafayette College
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Northampton (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Northampton (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.
John S. Harriso	e, Address, and Telephone Number) on, Esq., Broughal & DeVito, L.L.P. ot., Bethlehem, PA 18018; (610) 865-3	Attorneys (If Known) Unknown. 8664
	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	PTF DEF Citizen of This State
🗇 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State
		Citizen or Subject of a
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL-PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 362 Personal Injury -	10 Agriculture
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 R	tate Court Appellate Court	Appeal to District Respond 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 6 Multidistrict Litigation 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment or filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Brief description of cause: Age discrimination in violation of	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		
VIII, RELATED CAS IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER
DATE 02/11/2011	SIGNATURE OF AT	John S. Harrison, Esquire
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

Case 5:11-cv-01071-MAM Document 1 Filed 02/11/11 Page 2 of 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

assignment to appropriate calendar.	-1. 100/0	
Address of Plaintiff: 783 American General Drive, Easton,	PA 18040	
Address of Defendant: 12 Markle Hall, Easton, PA 18042		
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 12 Markle Hall, Easton, PA	ditional Space)	
·	• '	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and		
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□ Unknown.	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No 🔀	
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Data Tarminatad	
Case Number:Judge	Date Terrimated.	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:		
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	r previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No 🔼	
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su action in this court?		
	Yes No 🗷	
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier nu		
terminated action in this court?	$_{\mathrm{Yes}}\square$ $_{\mathrm{No}}\mathbf{Z}$	
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights		
	Yes No 🔼	
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)		
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury	
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. ☐ Assault, Defamation	
4. □ Antitrust	4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury	
5. Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury	
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please	
	specify)	
7. 🕱 Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability	
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. □ Products Liability — Asbestos	
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases	
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)	
11. □ All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)		
ARBITRATION CERTIF		
John S. Harrison, Esq. , counsel of record do hereby certify:		
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be		
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;		
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.		
DATE: 2/11/11 // // // // // // // // // // //	53864	
/ Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#	
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	ithin one year previously terminated action in this court	
except as noted above.		
DATE: 2/11/11	53864	
DATE: 2/11/11 Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#	

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

LLIAM A. DAILEY,	:	CIVIL ACTION		
Plaintiff	:			
V. FAYETTE COLLEGE,	;			
Defendant.	: :	NO.		
plaintiff shall complete a Cas filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant s the plaintiff and all other par to which that defendant belief	se Management Track Designary as a copy on all defendants. (See event that a defendant does not hall, with its first appearance, sties, a Case Management Trackeyes the case should be assigned			
	OLLOWING CASE MANAG			
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases b	prought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241	1 through § 2255. ()		
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.				
(c) Arbitration – Cases requi	ired to be designated for arbitra	tion under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()		
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ing claims for personal injury o	or property damage from		
commonly referred to as	Cases that do not fall into tracks complex and that need special ide of this form for a detailed e	or intense management by		
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not fall into any			
2/11/11	Cha to J	John S. Harrison, Esquire		
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for		
(610) 865-3664	(610) 865-0969	john-harrison@rcn.com		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

WILLIAM A. DAILEY,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	: Civil Action No	
v.	:	
•	: JURY TRIAL DEI	MANDED
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,	:	
	•	

COMPLAINT AND JURY TRIAL DEMAND

Defendant

Plaintiff William A. Dailey (hereinafter, "Mr. Dailey"), by and through his undersigned counsel, Broughal & DeVito, L.L.P., files the instant Complaint against Defendant Lafayette College (hereinafter, "Lafayette"), averring as follows:

Nature of Action

1. This is an action for age discrimination and age-based harassment.

Parties

- 2. Mr. Dailey was born on June 7, 1958 and is presently 52 years old.
- 3. Lafayette College is a non-profit corporation organized pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and having an address situated at 12 Markle Hall, Easton, Pennsylvania 18042.
 - 4. Lafayette College employs more than 1,000 employees.

Procedural Prerequisites

- 5. Mr. Dailey was terminated from his employment with Lafayette College on April 30, 2008.
- 6. On or about November 10, 2008, Mr. Dailey filed a written Charge of Discrimination and supporting Affidavit with the EEOC.
- 7. More than sixty (60) days have passed since Mr. Dailey filed his claim with the EEOC.
- 8. On or about November 15, 2010, the EEOC issued a Right to Sue letter to Mr. Dailey.

Facts

- 9. Mr. Dailey began working as a Network Engineer for Lafayette College in August 1998.
- 10. During Mr. Dailey's career at Lafayette College, he received a promotion to the position of Group Leader Network Engineer.
- 11. In his role as Group Leader, Mr. Dailey was responsible for the network portion of Lafayette College's Information Technology Services and had two Network Engineers reporting to him.
- 11. In or around January 2004, Lafayette College hired John O'Keefe, an individual under the age of 30, to a managerial position over Mr. Dailey.
- 12. In or about 2006, Lafayette College initiated the process of designing and building a new network that would, in relevant part, operate using Cisco software.

- 13. At the time of its implementation, Lafayette College, by and through John O' Keefe and Neil McElroy, the Dean of Libraries and Information Technology, assured Mr. Dailey that he would have an opportunity to obtain training for the new network.
- 14. Rather than insuring that Mr. Dailey received such training, Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, began a practice and pattern of discriminating against and harassing Mr. Dailey, as well as other employees over the age of 40.
- 15. As part of the aforesaid practice and pattern of harassment and discrimination, Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, replaced older employees with substantially younger employees.
- 16. As part of the aforesaid practice and pattern of harassment and discrimination, Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, repeatedly and publicly humiliated Mr. Dailey by suggesting that he was too old to comprehend and/or operate the new network.
- 17. Examples of the age-based harassment, humiliation and discrimination to which Mr. Dailey was subjected include the following:
 - a. Despite its assurances to the contrary, Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, refused to establish a training curriculum—including training requirements, mandatory classes, suggested classes, guidelines, goals and/or milestones—for Mr. Dailey to follow;
 - b. Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, specifically insured that its significantly younger employees had access to and were able to attend training sessions that would enable them to comprehend and/or operate the new network;

- c. Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, specifically excluded Mr. Dailey from those training sessions provided to its significantly younger employees;
- d. Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, refused to acknowledge that Mr. Dailey successfully learned and implemented the information he obtained at those training sessions he was able to attend;
- e. Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, persisted in suggesting that Mr. Dailey was too old to comprehend and/or operate the new system; and
- f. Despite assuring Mr. Dailey he would have an opportunity to learn the new system, Lafayette College, by and through John O'Keefe and Neil McElroy, immediately and unjustifiably began to criticize his performance although it had been exemplary at all times material hereto.
- 18. On February 14, 2008, Lafayette College informed Mr. Dailey that his employment was terminated effective April 30, 2008.
- 19. On February 14, 2008, Lafayette College instructed Mr. Dailey that he was to work from his home until April 30, 2008.
- 20. It is reasonably believed and, therefore, averred that Lafayette College exclusively interviewed individuals under the age of 40 to replace Mr. Dailey.
- 21. Mr. Dailey was replaced by Michael Costello, an individual approximately 20 years younger than he.

COUNT I (AGE DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION OF ADEA)

22. Mr. Dailey incorporates by reference herein the allegations contained in Paragraphs Nos. 1 through 21, *supra*, as though fully set forth at length hereinafter.

- 23. Mr. Dailey is over 40 years old.
- 24. Mr. Dailey was qualified for his position.
- 25. As more fully set forth, *supra*, Lafayette College discriminated against Mr. Dailey with respect to the terms and conditions of his employment because of his age.
- 26. As more fully set forth, *supra*, Lafayette College replaced Mr. Dailey with a significantly younger employee.
- 27. Lafayette College willfully discriminated against Mr. Dailey in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

WHEREFORE, Mr. Dailey respectfully requests this Honorable Court enter judgment in his favor and against Lafayette College by awarding him relief including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Back pay, front pay and all lost benefits, as well as other compensation;
- b. Reinstatement and upgrading;
- c. Liquidated damages;
- d. Prejudgment interest;
- e. Attorney fees and costs;
- f. A declaration that Lafayette College's conduct violated the Age Discrimination in Employment Act; and
- g. Any such other relief as this Honorable Court deems fitting.

COUNT II (AGE-BASED HARASSMENT IN VIOLATION OF ADEA)

- 28. Mr. Dailey incorporates by reference herein the allegations contained in Paragraphs Nos. 1 through 27, *supra*, as though fully set forth at length hereinafter.
 - 29. Lafayette College harassed Mr. Dailey because of his age.
- 30. The harassment was sufficient, severe and pervasive enough to alter the conditions of employment and create an abusive working environment for Mr. Dailey.
- 31. The harassment engaged in by Lafayette College was carried out by Mr. Dailey's superiors.
- 32. Submission to the age-based harassment was implicitly made a term of Mr. Dailey's employment.
 - 33. The harassment affected Mr. Dailey to his detriment.
- 34. The harassment would detrimentally affect any reasonable person in the same situation as Mr. Dailey.

WHEREFORE, Mr. Dailey respectfully requests this Honorable Court enter judgment in his favor and against Lafayette College by awarding him relief including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Back pay, front pay and all lost benefits, as well as other compensation;
- b. Reinstatement and upgrading;
- c. Liquidated damages;
- d. Prejudgment interest;

- e. Attorney fees and costs;
- f. A declaration that Lafayette College's conduct violated the Age Discrimination in Employment Act; and
- g. Any such other relief as this Honorable Court deems fitting.

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

By:

35. Mr. Dailey requests trial by jury in the instant litigation.

BROUGHAL & DeVITO, L.L.P.

Date: February 11, 2011

JOHN S. HARRÍSON, ESQ.

Attorney ID No. 53864

Attorney for Plaintiff William A. Dailey

38 West Market Street Bethlehem, PA 18018

Telephone No. (610) 865-3664

Facsimile No. (610) 865-0969